## Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is urged in view of the new claims above and comments which follow.

Taking the matters raised by the examiner in turn, the objection to the Information Disclosure Statement set forth by the examiner on the top of page 3 of the office action is not understood. The references cited in the international search report do not appear to have been submitted by the applicant either on April 11, 2002 or with the application (since it is unclear from the examiner's comments as to when the references apparently have appeared in the application). If the examiner can provide additional information, it would be appreciated. It appears that the references actually were transmitted by the International Bureau, and therefore no Form PTO-1449 would have been appropriate.

The examiner has rejected claims 83 through 88 under 35 U.S.C. §112 for the reasons enunciated by the examiner in the office action. It has been decided to cancel those claims, and provide a new claim set as set forth above. That claim set is directed to the subject matter of claims 62 through 73, and it is believed that the problems raised under 35 U.S.C. §112 have been solved. Also, the Seed reference cited by the examiner is not applicable to these new claims, which are directed to the method for detecting intracellular integrase activity.

In view of the above, the examiner's further reconsideration of the application is awaited.

May 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr.

Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4800

(312) 759-5646 (fax)